



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,420	06/20/2001	Detlev Gliitenberg	7393/71602	9919

22242 7590 07/16/2002

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY  
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

BRUNSMAN, DAVID M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1755

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MF-8

**Office Action Summary**

Application N .

09/884,420

Applicant(s)

GLITTENBERG ET AL.

Examiner

David M Brunsman

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1755

Applicant's election of group I in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). The argument all claims should be examined "consistent with MPEP section 803 objectives" does not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors. Upon allowance of compositions claims, claims to the process of using commensurate in scope with the allowed claims and in compliance with section 112 would be rejoined.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0282415, JP 05230792 or JP 08296193, as described by the instant specification in view of WO 99/64677.

The primary references teach compositions containing amphoteric (anionic demand about 0) mixtures of anionic and cationic starches in ratios similar to the instant claims. The difference between those references and the instant claims is the use of at least one waxy starch such as an anionic oxidized waxy modified with maleic or succinic anhydride. WO 99/64677 teaches the use of anionic oxidized waxy modified with maleic or succinic anhydride (see page 7, lines 28-32) improves the strength of the paper produced. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the modified starch of WO 99/64677 for the anionic starches of the three primary references in order to increase strength.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The scope and meaning of the term (PCD) is undefined. The use of the parentheses also renders the claim indefinite in that it is unclear if the limitation therein is required.

Having thus determined the scope and content of the prior art and the level of skill in the said art at the time the invention was made, it is the examiner's position that the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

The mere failure of a reference to disclose all the advantages asserted by applicant is no a substitute for actual differences in properties. In re DeBlauwe, 222 USPQ 191. An apparently old composition cannot be converted into an unobvious one simply by the discovery of a characteristic one cannot glean from the cited prior art. Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner, 227 USPQ 773.

Accordingly, the burden of proof is upon applicant to show that the instantly claimed subject matter is different from and unobvious over that taught by the prior art relied upon. In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685, 689; In re Best, 195 USPQ 430; In re Marosi, 21 USPQ 289, 293.

Any evidence to be presented under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely. It is anticipated that the next office action will be a final rejection.

Any foreign language documents submitted by applicant have been considered to the extent the short explanation of significance, English abstract or English equivalent allow.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 1755

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M Brunzman whose telephone number is 703-308-3454.

The examiner can normally be reached on M, Tu, Th, F; 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on 703-308-3823. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

David M Brunzman  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1755



DMB  
July 12, 2002